**THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE V.V.S.RAO**

WRIT PETITION No.25091 of 2006

01.12.2006

Between:

Smt.M.Saraswathi, W/o.late M.Krishna Reddy

... Petitioner

AND

The District Collector, Ranga Reddy District at Lakdikapool, Hyderabad

And others

... Respondents

**THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE V.V.S. RAO**

WRIT PETITION No.25091 of 2006

ORDER:

This writ petition is filed seeking a writ of Mandamus declaring the proceedings dated 09.11.2006 of the third respondent in rejecting the application made by one Basanth Reddy to incorporate his name and the names of other claimants in the relevant Government Order. The petitioner also seeks a consequential direction to respondents 1 to 5 to restore the names of the original owners in the revenue records as per Notification issued under Section 4(1) of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (the Act, for brevity) and published in Gazette Notification No.328, dated 01.11.1966 in respect of land admeasuring Acs.19.34 guntas in survey Nos.220 and 221 of Kapra village of Keesara Mandal in Ranga Reddy District (the subject land).

The subject land was acquired for Nuclear Fuel Complex (NFC) in 1966. After completing the proceedings, compensation was paid and the subject land absolutely vested in the Government. However, considering the subsequent events including the fact that NFC did not utilize the entire extent of the subject land, Government issued orders in G.O.Ms.No.375, dated 07.9.2002 under Section 48 of the act withdrawing certain portion of the land from the acquisition proceedings. The same was assailed before this Court in a writ petition being W.P.No.24641 of 2005. The same was dismissed on 21.11.2005. A Division Bench of this Court also affirmed the order of the learned Single Judge against which a Special Leave Petition (SLP) was filed in Supreme Court unsuccessfully. Therefore, on 03.2.2006, Basanth Reddy filed application seeking the benefits under G.O.Ms.No.375, dated 07.9.2002 wherein the Government issued Notification under Section 48 of the Act. The third respondent having regard to the number of writ petitions and writ appeals decided by this Court against all these persons like petitioner claiming a share in the property were dismissed, rejected the application.

Heard the learned Counsel for the petitioner and learned Assistant Government Pleader for Revenue (General-T).

This Court has dismissed three writ petitions arising out of G.O.Ms.No.375, dated 07.9.2002 and all the points raised herein are fully covered in these judgments, which were also affirmed by the Division Bench.

The writ petition is, therefore, wholly misconceived and is accordingly dismissed. No costs.

_____

December 01, 2006 (**V.V.S.RAO, J**)

YS